



PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

**2011-12 FINANCIAL AND PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES
GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

DEPARTMENT OF SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

SECTION A: **Output variations****Question 1**

Please provide copies of all of your department's/agency's annual plans, business plans, strategic plans, corporate plans or similar relating to 2011-12 (these are requested in accordance with Section 28(1) of the *Parliamentary Committees Act 2003*) unless they are online. If they are online, please specify the document name and web address:

NOTE: The Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE) Corporate Plans are based on a calendar year as opposed to a financial year. As such, the following corporate plans are submitted as they relate to the period 2011-12.

Document	Web address:
DSE Annual Report 2012	www.dse.vic.gov.au/about-dse/publications/annual-report
DSE Corporate Plan 2012-2015 (hard copy attached)	
DSE Corporate Plan 2010-2013 (hard copy attached)	
DSE Corporate Plan 2008-2011 (hard copy attached)	

Question 2 (departments only)

In relation to the departmental outputs listed in the budget papers, please provide a detailed explanation for all instances where an output cost for 2011-12 varied from the initial target (**not** the revised estimate) by greater than ± 10 per cent:

Output	Budget estimate for 2011-12 (2011-12 budget papers)	Actual expenditure 2011-12 (2011-12 annual report)	Explanation	Impact on the community of reduced/increased expenditure compared to budget
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		
Public Land	125.3	138.3	As outlined on page 57 of the 2011-12 Annual Report, the 2011-12 Actual is higher than the 2011-12 target	The funding allowed the Department to undertake

			due to funding for the Flood Recovery Community Infrastructure Fund.	natural emergency reconstruction and recovery works.
Environmental Policy and Climate Change	60.7	54.3	As outlined on page 51 of the 2011-12 Annual Report, the 2011-12 Actual is lower than the 2011-12 target due to the completion of a number of projects following the Commonwealth Government's move towards the introduction of a carbon price.	No community impact.
Biodiversity	88.4	77.3	As outlined on page 49 of the 2011-12 Annual Report, the 2011-12 Actual is lower than the 2011-12 target due to the timing of payments through Native Vegetation Credit Trading Agreements.	No community impact.
Statutory Activities and Environment Protection	181.1	135.3	As outlined on page 52 of the 2011-12 Annual Report, the 2011-12 Actual is lower than the 2011-12 target due to lower than expected grant payments out of the Sustainability Fund.	No community impact.

Question 3 (departments only)

In relation to the following performance measures where there was a substantial difference between the 2011-12 expected outcome published in the 2012-13 budget papers (May 2012) and the actual outcome for 2011-12, please explain:

- (a) why these figures vary (i.e. why was it not possible to provide a more accurate estimate in May 2012); and
- (b) how the 2011-12 expected outcome was calculated.

While detailed reasons for the differences between the 2011-12 expected outcome and the 2011-12 actual result are provided below, it should be noted that in the majority of cases, expected outcomes are projected early in the calendar year, in order to meet the timelines for the preparation of the annual Budget Papers

Performance measure	2011-12 expected outcome (2012-13 budget papers)	Actual outcome for 2011-12 (2011-12 annual report)	Why do these figures vary?	How was the 2011-12 expected outcome calculated?
Increase in EPA notices issued for illegal dumping of waste (percentage)	15	69	The 2011-12 Actual outcome is higher than the 2011-12 expected outcome due to the higher than anticipated use of the EPA's new free iPhone litter application. The new iPhone litter application has been designed to make it easier for the public to report littering which has resulted in an increase in notices issued by EPA.	The 2011-12 expected outcome was calculated by extrapolating previous years data as well as taking into consideration any trends or emerging issues for 2011-12. As such, the 2012-13 target has been revised to take into consideration the increased awareness and use of the new iPhone application.
Beach protection assets repaired (number)	2	6	The higher 2011-12 Actual outcome reflects the work undertaken by the Department, through the <i>Flood Recovery Community Infrastructure Fund</i> , to repair coastal community assets damaged by the devastating 2012 floods.	The 2011-12 expected outcome is calculated from an rolling annual work schedule for this initiative based on risk assessments beach condition assessments. The exact timing and priority of project delivery is dependant on weather conditions.
Rivers and wetland systems with improved environmental flows being delivered (number)	32	69	In 2011-12, over 516,000 ML of water was delivered by the VEWH to 35 river reaches and 10 wetlands, providing significant benefit to a wide range of water-dependent plants and animals. In addition, contributions to environmental water were made by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Office and the Living Murray Program.	In December each year, the Victorian Environmental Water Holder: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> calculates the number of sites already watered to date and the volume that is remaining, and estimates the additional water that is likely to become available for the remainder of the water year. This could be through additional allocation announcements or water to be transferred from other environmental water holdings through agreements (the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder and the Living Murray).
Major policy papers, strategy reviews or research papers completed	7	10	In May 2012, Melbourne hosted the United Nations Expert Meeting on Ecosystem Accounts. This provided the opportunity for the Department to present several major policy papers on ecosystem	The 2011-12 expected outcome was calculated by taking into consideration the number of major policy papers and research reports completed in previous years, in addition to any potential emerging issues for

(number)			and biodiversity accounting. The higher 2011-12 Actual outcome is a result of the papers presented by the Department at this meeting.	2011-12. In an attempt to ensure consistency across financial years, the division only considered papers or reviews that are published, released publically or tabled in Parliament.
Environmental condition research reports issued, improvement tools, guidelines, policies, systems and plans completed and issued (number)	54	77	As a result of increased community demand and awareness around environmental issues, in 2011-12, EPA implemented a range of measures aimed at better engaging with Victorians to help detect, prevent and rectify environmental harm. These reforms have lead to an increase in the number of reports, tools, guidelines etc issued by EPA for the purposes of providing greater certainty for business and better environmental protection for Victorians.	When calculating the 2011-12 expected outcome for this performance measure, the Department extrapolated previous year's data as well taking into consideration any trends or emerging issues for 2011-12.
Length of river where works have been undertaken to stabilise bank erosion (km)	138	65.9	Due to significant flooding events, work programs aimed at stabilising bank erosion were delayed resulting in a lower than anticipated 2011-12 Actual outcome.	Each Catchment Management Authority (CMA) formulates an Annual Work Plan, and they calculate what outputs will be delivered based on this work plan. At 31 December each year, each CMA provides both their half year actual and their estimate for the remainder of the year. The re-estimate takes into account any shifts in the work plan. These two figures are totalled from each CMA to calculate the Expected Outcome.
Rebates approved for small business for improved water efficiency (number)	500	78	As a result of easing water restrictions and above average rainfall across the State, rebate uptake by small businesses reduced during 2011-12.	The 2011-12 expected outcome was calculated using a model which took into consideration the economic and climatic conditions at that point in time. A downturn in economic conditions, combined with a change in rainfall patterns negatively influenced the actual outcome for this performance measure.
Regional investment plans align with government directions (number)	100	0	As a result of the extension of the Natural Resource Investment Program to 2014-15, the Catchment Management Authorities were granted additional time to revise and resubmit their Regional Investment Plans.	The expected outcome is calculated against performance to date trends for CMAs submitting investment plans. When changes to investment affect that years planning, the Department provides CMAs with additional time to submit their plans.

Regional investment plans proposing natural resources improvement projects submitted, assessed and recommended to responsible Minister(s) for funding (number)	10	0	As a result of the extension of the Natural Resource Investment Program to 2014-15, the Catchment Management Authorities were granted additional time to revise and resubmit their Regional Investment Plans.	Regional investment plans are generally submitted by the end of April each year. When changes to investment affect that years planning, the Department provides CMAs with additional time to submit their plans.
---	----	---	---	--

Question 4 (departments only)

Regarding the Department's performance measures in the budget papers:

- (a) How did the Department's 2011-12 results influence departmental planning in 2012-13?

The collective results of the 2011-12 performance measures are considered in the subsequent years planning cycle, along with the Department's assessment of strategic priorities and risks in line with the Victorian Government priorities. It is noted that the Department revised its 2012-13 targets for performance measures based on the 2011-12 outcomes.

- (b) Please detail all changes planned for 2012-13 as a consequence of actual results for any performance measures not meeting the targets in 2011-12.

A large proportion of performance measures for the Sustainable Water Management and Supply Output are reliant on favourable climatic conditions. The Department responds to weather conditions as they arise and adjusts future year's targets where necessary.

Due to a deferral of program activity, the "*Number of hectares treated to minimise the impact of pest plants, pest animals and overabundant native animals in parks managed by Parks Victoria*" (under the Biodiversity Output) performance measure did not meet its 2011-12 Target. As a consequence, the Department has increased the 2013-14 target to account for program activity being deferred to 2013-14.

The "*Area covered by regional land health projects*" (under the Natural Resources Output) is heavily reliant on favourable weather conditions. The Department responds to weather conditions as they arise and adjusts future year's targets where necessary.

During 2012-13, EPA will implement improved compliance work and standardise reporting systems in order to address the "*notices complied with by due date or escalation in line with Compliance and Enforcement policy*" which did not meet its 2011-12 target.

A large proportion of performance measures for the Land and Fire Management Output are reliant on favourable climatic conditions. The Department responds to weather conditions as they arise and adjusts future year's targets where necessary.

.Question 5 (departments only)

This question does not apply to your department.

.Question 6 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your department.

SECTION B: Asset investment (departments only)

Question 7

Please provide a detailed explanation in relation to why the TEI has changed for each of the following projects:

Project	TEI (2011-12 budget papers)	TEI (2012-13 budget papers)	Explanation
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Fire Web (various)	7.4	28.6	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$21.2 million from output funding to asset funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.
Restoring and re-opening Victoria's parks (statewide)	45.7	9.2	The TEI has decreased to due lower than expected flood damage.
Walking trails (statewide)	1.5	1.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.5 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.

Question 8

For each of the following asset investment projects, please provide:

- the total expenditure to 30 June 2012 (using actual figures, rather than the estimate in the budget papers);
- the actual expenditure in 2011-12;
- explanations for any variations greater than ± 10 per cent between the actual expenditure and what was estimated in the Budget at the start of the year;

- (d) details of any funding carried forward from 2011-12 to 2012-13;
- (e) the completion date as estimated at 30 June 2011;
- (f) the completion date as estimated at 30 June 2012; and
- (g) an explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date between 2011 and 2012.

Project	Actual expenditure to 30/06/2012	Estimated expenditure in 2011-12 (2011-12 budget papers)	Actual expenditure in 2011-12	Explanation for any variations greater than ±10 per cent between estimated and actual expenditure	Funding carried over from 2011-12 to 2012-13	Estimated completion date as at 30/6/2011	Estimated completion date as at 30/6/2012	Explanation for any changes to the estimated completion date
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)		(\$ million)			
Asset replacement and renewal at Victoria's parks and public land (statewide)	2.1	8.4	2.1	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$6.3 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Asset replacement and renewal at Victoria's parks and public land (statewide)	5.8	4.1	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$4.1 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a

				the type of funding required.				
Barwon Water – Shell Recycling Project – construction (Barwon)	27.2	7.5	7.7	The variance is less than 10%.	0.0	June - 2013	June - 2013	n/a
Black Rock Water Recycling Project (Geelong)	7.0	2.0	6.0	Commonwealth funding for milestone payments for the Black Rock Water Recycling project were scheduled from 2010-11 to 2011-12 and 2012-13. The estimate for 2011-12 was \$6 million.	0.0	June - 2013	June - 2013	n/a
Cardinia North Parklands (Cardinia)	0.0	0.3	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.3 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a

Enhancing Victoria's parks and reserves (statewide)	0.7	0.4	0.02	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.4 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	0.03	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Fire Protection Access – bridge replacement (non-metro various)	51.6	15.0	13.7	The variance is less than 10%.	1.2	June - 2012	June - 2013	A minor component of the project was delayed due to the availability of contractors and poor weather conditions.
Fire Web (various)	5.2	1.6	1.2	The Department commissioned a review of the initiative to ensure it meets the needs and objectives of all key stakeholders. The variance is due to the longer than expected consultation process. The project remains on track to be completed by June 2014.	6.4	June - 2014	June - 2014	n/a

Flood recovery and repair on public land (statewide)	0.1	29.4	0.1	Due to lower than anticipated flood damage, the TEI for this initiative was reduced from \$22 million to \$7.4 million.	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Flood warning network – repair and improvement (statewide)	0.0 Note: As per page 111 of the 2011-12 Budget Paper 3, this initiative did not have any budget allocation for 2011-12.	0.0	0.0	The variance is less than 10%.	0.0	June - 2015	June - 2015	n/a
Geelong-Melbourne pipeline (various)	20.0	11.0	11.0	The variance is less than 10%.	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Goulburn Murray irrigation district flood recovery and floodplain restoration (statewide)	0.0	10.6	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$10.6 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	June - 2012	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Grasslands (metro various)	13.0	20.0	3.0	The variance relates to a lower	0.0	Ongoing	Ongoing	n/a

				than expected expenditure in relation to land acquisitions. Land acquisition is reliant on contributions from developers.				
Improved bushfire prevention, preparedness, response and recovery (statewide)	13.0	9.3	4.0	The variance is a result of a slightly longer than anticipated design and planning phase as part of the Department's Fire Appliance Review project. The project remains on track to be completed in June 2014.	5.4	June - 2014	June - 2014	n/a
Increased planned burning (statewide)	2.0	8.0	2.0	Contracts as part of providing new and improved fire fighting facilities were unable to be finalised until the completion of the 2011-12 fire season. Works have now commenced.	6.0	June - 2012	June - 2013	The contracts were unable to be finalised until the 2011-12 fire season was complete. Works have now commenced.
Kokoda Track Memorial Walk Upgrade (Ferntree Gully)	0.0	1.0	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a

				\$0.4 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.				
Lower Loddon floodplain and groundwater bore works (statewide)	0.0	1.7	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$1.7 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	0.0	June – 2012	June – 2012	n/a
National reserve – land acquisition (metropolitan)	0.8	0.4	0.01	The program completed in 2011-12. The variance in the program is due to lower than expected expenditure in 2011-12. There was no impact on the program delivery.	0.2	Ongoing	June – 2012	

Northern Victoria Irrigation Renewal Project (non-metro various)	509.7	96.8	79.8	Following approval for NVIRP Stage 2, the completion date for NVIRP Stage 1 was extended to 2017-18 to align with Stage 2. This required re-phasing of cashflows.	34.0	June - 2013	June - 2018	Following approval for NVIRP Stage 2, the completion date for NVIRP Stage 1 was extended to 2017-18 to align with Stage 2.
Project 000 Response (statewide)	3.4	22.1	2.4	The Project 000 Response required significant testing and on going development planning between Department of Justice, CFA and DSE / Networked Emergency agencies. Funding in 2012-13 will be used for the implementation of upgrades to the DSE/NEO fleet, aligning with the CFA Regional Despatch System to provide a consistent and interoperable state-wide system.	11.3	June - 2012	June - 2013	Due to the longer than anticipated testing of the project, there has been a delay in the completion date.
Restoring and re-opening Victoria's parks (statewide)	1.2	36.4	0.0	Due to lower than expected flood damages, the TEI	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2013	

				for this initiative was reduced from \$36.4 million to \$7.0 million.				
River Red Gums (non-metro various)	2.7	2.4	2.4	The variance is less than 10%	0.0	June - 2013	June - 2013	n/a
Victorian Bushfire Information Line (Ballarat)	0.0	0.5	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.5 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	0.0	June - 2012	June - 2012	n/a
Victorian Water Trust assets – upgrades (various)	132.2	7.2	1.4	DSE has extended its community stakeholder consultation, leading to a temporary minor delay.	7.0	June - 2013	June - 2013	n/a
Walking trails (statewide)	0.1	0.5	0.1	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer	0.2	June - 2015	June - 2015	n/a

				approximately \$0.21 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Question 9

- (a) Please detail (in aggregate for each of the following categories) the expenditure of the Department (including any controlled entities)¹ on asset projects not listed in the 2011-12 Budget Paper No.4:

Category of projects	Expenditure in 2011-12 (\$ million)
Projects with a TEI less than \$250,000	0.1
Projects with a TEI greater than \$250,000 but planned expenditure in 2011-12 under \$75,000	0.0
Capital grants paid to other sectors of government	0.0
Other projects included in 'payments for non-financial assets' on the cash flow statement for the Department but not listed in Budget Paper No.4 for 2011-12	30.7

¹ i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

- (b) If the total of expenditures listed in response to part (a) plus the total of actual expenditures for 2011-12 identified in Question 6 is not equal to the 'payments for non-financial assets' in the Department's budget portfolio outcomes statement in the annual report, please explain why:

As per page 166 of the DSE Annual Report 2012, the total of the Department's budget portfolio outcomes statement for non financial assets for 2011-12 was \$65.5 million. This amount included payments for non financial assets by DSE, Commissioner for Environment, Victorian Environmental Water Holder and Environment Protection Authority.

The total of expenditure listed in part (a) above is \$30.8 million, which equates to a variance of \$34.7 million. This variance is primarily due to projects listed in the Budget Paper No. 4 (BP4) for 2011-12. Of the \$65.5 million, \$28.3 million was reported in BP4. The remaining funding relates to prepaid non financial assets in 2011-12.

Question 10

Please provide the total actual investment (i.e. how much the project actually cost) for each of the following asset projects which were completed in 2011-12 and explain any differences between that and the TEI published in the 2011-12 budget papers:

Project	TEI in the 2011-12 budget papers	Total actual investment	Explanation for any variations greater than ± 10 per cent	Impact of any variations
Asset replacement and renewal at Victoria's parks and public land (statewide)	8.4	2.1	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> was approved to transfer approximately \$6.3 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts
Asset replacement and renewal at Victoria's parks and public land (statewide)	9.9	5.8	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> was approved to transfer approximately \$4.1 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts

Cardinia North Parklands (Cardinia)	0.3	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.3 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts
Enhancing Victoria's parks and reserves (statewide)	1.3	0.7	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.6 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts
Flood recovery and repair on public land (statewide)	29.4	0.1	Following final assessments of damages caused by flooding on public land, the TEI was reduced from \$29.4 million to \$7.4 million, reflecting less damage than previously anticipated. In addition, a section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$0.1 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts
Geelong-Melbourne pipeline (various)	20.0	20.0	N/A	No impacts

Kokoda Track Memorial Walk Upgrade (Ferntree Gully)	1.0	0.0	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer approximately \$1.0 million from asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.	No impacts
National reserve – land acquisition (metropolitan)	2.3	0.8	The program completed in 2011-12. The variance in the program is due to lower than expected expenditure in 2011-12. There was no impact on the program delivery.	No impacts

Question 11

Please detail the status of each of the following asset projects which are listed in the 2011-12 Budget Paper No.4 but do not appear in the 2012-13 Budget Paper No.4 as either an existing or completed project:

Project	Current status	Latest approved/final TEI	Construction completion date/estimated construction completion date (including the commissioning phase)	Why this was not listed in the 2012-13 Budget Paper No.4 as either existing or completed
Goulburn Murray irrigation district flood recovery and floodplain restoration (statewide)	Completed	0.0	n/a	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act</i> 1994 was approved to transfer asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.
Lower Loddon floodplain and	Completed	0.0	n/a	A section 30 request under the

groundwater bore works (statewide)				<i>Financial Management Act 1994 was approved to transfer asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.</i>
Victorian Bushfire Information Line (Ballarat)	Completed	0.0	n/a	A section 30 request under the <i>Financial Management Act 1994</i> was approved to transfer asset funding to output funding. The total funding for the project has not changed, only the type of funding required.

Question 12

For each of your entity's public private partnership projects in 2011-12, please detail the entity's expenditure in 2011-12 in the following categories:

- the amount paid that was classified as 'finance charges on finance leases' and a description of what that money was for;
- the amount paid as 'operating lease payments' and a description of what that money was for; and
- any other expenses and a description of what that money was for.

Project	Finance charges on finance leases in 2011-12		Operating lease payments in 2011-12		Any other expenses in 2011-12	
	(\$ million)	What that money covered	(\$ million)	What that money covered	(\$ million)	What that money covered
Victorian Desalination Project	0		0		0	

Question 13

Please list each project funded by the Department (including controlled entities)² for which the funding is included in the 'net cash flows from investments in financial assets for policy purposes' in the general government sector cash flow statement, detailing for each:

- (a) the estimated expenditure in 2011-12;
- (b) the actual expenditure in 2011-12; and
- (c) for any project completed in 2011-12, what policy purposes were achieved.

Project	Estimated expenditure in 2011-12	Actual expenditure in 2011-12	What policy purposes were achieved (where applicable)
National E-Conveyancing Development	\$5.25 million	\$10.282 million	<p>National E-Conveyancing Development Ltd was established and provided with equity funding and intellectual property by the establishing State Government and bank share holders.</p> <p>The company began development of an IT platform that will implement the COAG deregulation to priority to deliver "A single national electronic system for land title transactions".</p> <p>The estimated expenditure was based on the equity for the project and did not take into consideration intellectual property. As a result, there is a variance between the estimated and actual expenditure.</p>

² i.e. please provide this information on the same basis of consolidation as the budget papers

SECTION C: Revenue and revenue foregone

Question 14

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than ± 10 per cent between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total revenue/income in your operating statement.

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

Revenue category	2010-11 actual	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent	Impact of variances
Interest	7.8	10.5	Interest income increased in line with increased cash balances arising from higher landfill levy receipts.	Nil
Grants	51.2	98.2	The variance relates primarily to the timing of milestone payments for flood recovery, native vegetation and Commonwealth funded initiatives.	Nil
Fair Value of assets and services received free of charge or for nominal consideration	0.7	0.2	The variance between the 2011-12 actual and the 2010-11 actual is a result of a one-off transaction in 2010-11 (land received free of charge from DTF).	Nil
Other income	290.1	327.3	Income increased as result of 2011-12 budget policy decision to increase the rate of landfill levy.	Nil

Question 15

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than ± 10 per cent between the initial budget (**not** the revised estimate) and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each revenue/income category detailed in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total revenue/income in your operating statement.

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

Revenue category	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent	Impact of variances
Interest	6.6	10.5	Interest income increased in line with increased cash balances arising from higher landfill levy receipts.	Nil
Sales of goods and services	41.6	53.2	Additional revenue was received for the Sustainability Accord and BushBroker Native Vegetation Offsets.	Nil

Question 16

Please provide an itemised schedule of any concessions and subsidies (revenue foregone) (see the Explanatory Memorandum for a definition of concessions and subsidies) provided by your organisation in 2011-12. For each item, please:

- (a) describe the purpose of the concession/subsidy;
- (b) explain any variations greater than ± 10 per cent between the actual expenditure and the initial budget for the year;
- (c) indicate the number of concessions/subsidies granted in each category; and

- (d) explain whether the outcomes in the community³ expected to be achieved by granting these concessions or providing these subsidies have been achieved.

Concession/ subsidy	Purpose	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent	Number of concessions/subsidies granted in 2011-12	Outcomes achieved
<p>The Department does not provide any concessions or subsidies as defined by the explanatory memorandum.</p> <p>Water Corporations provide Health and Pension Card holder concessions however this is a Department of Human Services funded initiative.</p>						

Question 17 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your department.

SECTION D: Expenditure

Question 18

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than ± 10 per cent between the prior year's actual result and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each expenditure category detailed in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total expenditure in your operating statement.

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

³ 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

Expenditure category	2010-11 actual	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent	Impact of variances
Interest expenses	1.0	2.0	The movement in provisions as a result of changes in discount rates is accounted for as an interest expense. The movement in 2011-12 led to a higher interest expense.	Nil

Question 19

Please explain and detail the impact of any variances greater than ± 10 per cent between the initial budget (not the revised budget) and the actual result for 2011-12 for:

- (a) each expenditure category detail in your operating statement; and
- (b) the total expenditure in your operating statement.

For departments, please provide data consolidated on the same basis as the budget portfolios outcomes statement in your annual reports.

Expenditure category	2011-12 Budget	2011-12 actual	Explanations for variances greater than ± 10 per cent	Impact of variances
Interest expenses	2.4	2.0	The interest expense related to changes in the discount rate for provisions that were lower than budgeted.	Nil
Other operating expenses	471.4	385.6	Expenditure for a number of trust fund projects was lower than budgeted. In addition, adverse weather conditions decreased the amount of planned burning that was completed.	Nil

Question 20 (departments only)

The 2011-12 budget papers indicate that \$184.2 million of output funding allocated for expenditure in 2011-12 by previous budgets was 'reprioritised or adjusted'. This is in addition to any savings or efficiencies resulting from savings measures. For the Department (including all controlled entities),⁴ please indicate:

- (a) what areas of expenditure (including projects and programs if appropriate) the funding was reprioritised/adjusted from (i.e. what the funding was initially provided for);
- (b) for each area of expenditure (or project or program), how much funding was reprioritised; and
- (c) the impact on those areas of the reprioritisation/adjustment.

Area of expenditure originally funded	Value of funding reprioritised/adjusted (\$ million)	Impact of reprioritisation/adjustment of funding
<p>The reprioritisation or adjustment of funding has occurred consistent with whole of agency requirements to meet relevant targets, while taking into account the needs of various parts of the agency.</p> <p>As previously outlined in the Victorian Government's response to the Committee's <i>Report on the 2011-12 Budget Estimates, Part Three</i>, Departments are funded on a global basis in the annual appropriation acts and ministers have the ability to reprioritise funding within their portfolio department.</p> <p>Reprioritisation decisions were funded through the department's internal budget allocation process, which included the identification of general efficiencies that could be found in corporate and back of house areas, with minimal impact on service delivery.</p>		

⁴ i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

Question 21

Please provide details of any evaluations of grants programs that were conducted by your department/agency in 2011-12, including any findings about:

- (a) the outcomes in the community⁵ achieved by the programs; or
- (b) the effectiveness of grants at achieving planned outcomes compared to other modes of service delivery.

Grant program	Evaluation conducted	Outcomes achieved	Effectiveness as a mode of service delivery
Victorian Adaptation and Sustainability Partnership (formerly the Victorian Local Sustainability Accord)	<i>Victorian Local Sustainability Accord 2010-12 Program Achievements</i>	<p>The evaluation found that the Victorian Adaptation and Sustainability Partnership has been instrumental in building capacity within councils to address sustainability and climate change issues. The provision of resources through the program has acted as a catalyst for councils to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement environment strategies and action plans • Develop knowledge and awareness among council staff and the community on sustainability and climate change • Improve learning and knowledge sharing between councils • Establish their baseline sustainability capacity, particularly rural/regional councils • Provide a platform for further work • Provide leadership through action in the area of sustainability, particularly rural/regional councils 	To deliver the required outcomes, grants were effective as a mode of service delivery for this initiative.
HazWaste Fund	<i>Evaluation of HazWaste Fund</i>	<p>The evaluation of the HazWaste Fund (HWF) found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The likely lifetime impact of the funded projects will see 	To deliver the required outcomes, grants were effective as a mode of service delivery for this initiative.

⁵ 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

		<p>diversion/remediation of one million tonnes of hazardous waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HWF has enabled organisations to achieve double the rate of waste reduction/diversion per annum compared with organisations not supported by the Fund • HWF has created new business and attracted investment in Victoria • HWF has produced cost savings for industry • HWF has supported pioneering research that has not been done anywhere else in the world • HWF has protected and improved the environment 	
Land Health Program	Effectiveness of grants for Property Management Plans (PMP) in addressing soil, salinity and land management issues	<p>The evaluation found that Property Management Plans (PMP), often also called Whole Farm Plans (WFP), play an important role in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assisting landholders formulate and document their goals and develop realistic plans towards meeting them • Helps link environment issues with production, economics and social aspects of land management <p>The evaluation also found that PMPs are seen by the community and landholders that participated as being highly valuable</p>	It was found that grants for PMPs were significant in achieving practice change that leads to improved soil and salinity outcomes.

Question 22 (departments only)

- (a) Please provide the following details about the realisation of efficiency and savings targets in 2011-12. In providing savings targets, please provide the cumulative target rather than the change in savings from one year to the next (i.e. provide the target on the same basis as in the budget papers). Please provide figures for the Department including its controlled entities.⁶

Initiative	Total value of efficiencies/savings expected to be realised in 2011-12 from that initiative \$m	Actual value of efficiencies/savings achieved from that initiative \$m	Explanation for any variations greater than ± 10 per cent
General efficiencies (2009-10 Budget)	12.0	12.0	
Government election commitment savings (2011-12 Budget)	19.3	19.3	
Measures to offset the GST reduction (2011-12 Budget)	12.5	12.5	
Maintain a sustainable public service (2011-12 Budget Update)*	0.0	0.0	
Other			

* In contrast to the other savings initiatives, the Budget Update indicated that, in the first year, it expected this initiative to have an increased cost rather than make a saving. Please clearly indicate whether the target and actual for your department for this initiative is an increased cost or a saving.

- (b) If any savings targets differ from what was initially indicated in the budget papers, please provide details.

Not applicable.

⁶ i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

Question 23 (departments only)

- (a) Please outline the Department's expenditure in 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12 and the savings targets for 2010-11 and 2011-12 for these areas targeted in the Government's election commitment savings. In providing savings targets, please provide the cumulative target rather than the change in savings from one year to the next (i.e. provide the target on the same basis as in the budget papers). Please provide figures for the Department including its controlled entities.⁷

Category	Actual expenditure			2010-11 savings target	2011-12 savings target	Explanation for any category that does not change between 2010-11 and 2011-12 in line with the savings target
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12			
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)			
Ministerial staff	0.000	0.000	0.000	9.4	9.4 + 19.3	DSE does not employ ministerial staff.
Media and marketing positions	2.295	2.439	2.365			
Consultants	20.000	3.000	0.000			
Government advertising	9.585	3.821	2.439			
Political opinion polling	0.000	0.000	0.000			
External legal advice	4.946	4.070	5.670			External legal advice is demand dependent. Extraordinary matters, such as the legal issues arising from the 2009 bushfires, can drive demand for external legal advice.
Senior public service travel	0.089	0.052	0.064			

⁷ i.e. please provide this information for the Department on the same basis of consolidation as is used in the budget papers

Government office floor space	12.564	14.239	12.928			
Supplies and consumables	6.289	5.806	5.476			
Shared services	18.482	21.988	23.977			Increase in shared services represents one-off expenditure and maintenance.
Head office staff	174.50	152.701	155.248			
Total				9.4	28.7	DSE has met the savings in line with Government expectations. However, please note that the actual expenditure from the previous year does not represent the baseline for the savings for the following year. Savings are calculated in line with budget for that year, which can increase due to timing of projects, wage costs, escalation and other factors.
	248.750	205.116	208.167			

(b) If details are not available for any of these categories, please advise:

(i) why details are not available; and

Savings were achieved through a general reduction across DSE in back office expense reductions including consultants, supplies and consumables and advertising.

(ii) what measures the Department has in place to monitor its achievement of the Government's election commitment savings targets.

The Department undertakes monthly financial reporting to monitor Departmental expenditure. The monthly reports are provided to and discussed at the Department's monthly executive management team meeting.

Question 24

Please detail all measures introduced to increase efficiency in 2011-12, including the cost of introducing each measure and the estimated savings as a result of the measure in 2011-12.

DSE recognises the need for Government departments to operate efficiently and effectively. As such DSE continually strives to improve operational efficiencies using existing resources. As noted in DSE's 2011-12 Annual Report, operational efficiencies have resulted in a number of output performance measure improvements, including increases in performance for:

1. Game and Wildlife Licence renewals (page 49 of 2011-12 Annual Report)
2. Reporting pollution incidents (page 52 of 2011-12 Annual Report)
3. Level of compliance with environmental regulatory framework for commercial timber operations as required by the Forest Audit Program (page 58 of 2011-12 Annual Report)
4. Auditing of the Vicmap digital database (page 59 of 2011-12 Annual Report)
5. Land dealings registered within five days (page 59 of 2011-12 Annual Report)
6. Bridges or stream crossings replaced or repaired (page 65 of 2011-12 Annual Report).

Additionally, DSE undertook the Strengthening DSE initiative in 2011-12 to help to build a highly reliable and efficient organisation centred on a stronger regional presence to make decisions and deliver services.

The initial phase focused on organisational restructuring to introduce a new regional model for the department to create a more visible, more connected and more empowered regional presence. In July 2011, DSE introduced a new organisational structure and created five regions, including a metropolitan region, each with a Regional Director and with an overall General Manager, Regional Services. In addition, three new Deputy Secretary positions were created to strengthen our executive structure to better support the evolving organisation and its leadership team. To build on these changes and ensure we have the flexibility and efficiency required to deliver government priorities while strengthening our capacity, capability and presence, DSE is also working on areas of corporate reform. DSE is reviewing processes for allocating budgets, specifying outcomes, setting priorities and business planning and reporting.

This restructuring was done within existing resources.

Question 25

Please detail any changes to your department's/agency's service delivery as a result of savings initiatives released since the change of government, e.g. changes to the timing and scope of specific programs or discontinued programs.

Departmental savings initiatives are focussed on head office and non-service delivery areas only. No changes have been made to the Department's service delivery as a result of savings initiatives released since the change of government.

SECTION E: Public sector workforce**Question 26**

Please detail the total full-time equivalent number of staff in your department/agency as at 30 June 2011 and 30 June 2012 in each of the following bands of levels, and explain the changes from one year to the next:

The Government's Sustainable Government Initiative announced on 15 December 2011 will affect workforce numbers in out-years and these figures should be read in that context.

Level	Total FTE (30 June 2011)	Total FTE (30 June 2012)	Explanation for changes
VPS Grades 1-3	879	794	<p>Net reductions due to SGI initiatives in the second half of the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural attrition • Recruitment freeze and non replacement of positions made vacant by natural attrition • Non renewal of fixed contracts where appropriate <p>This cohort reduction is slightly higher than the department average due to a higher percentage of fixed term contracts in this group with consequent non renewal implications.</p>
VPS Grade 4	585	538	<p>Net reductions due to SGI initiatives in the second half of the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural attrition • Recruitment freeze and non replacement of positions made vacant by natural attrition • Non renewal of fixed contracts where appropriate
VPS Grades 5-6 and STS	878	821	<p>Net reductions due to SGI initiatives in the second half of the year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural attrition • Recruitment freeze and non replacement of positions made vacant

			<p>by natural attrition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non renewal of fixed contracts where appropriate <p>This cohort reduction is slightly lower than the departmental average due to a lower percentage of fixed term contracts in this group with consequent non renewal implications.</p>
EO	41	40	Resultant net reduction due to Department realignment and restructure ongoing in 2011-12.
Total of all staff (including non-VPS grades)	2836	2617	<p>Net reductions for the first half of the year resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing efficiency initiatives within multiple divisions resulting from the organisational wide change to the Departments operating model giving an increased focus on regional capacity and on-ground service delivery <p>Increased rate of net reductions in the second half of the year resulting from SGI target strategies in place of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural attrition • Recruitment freeze and non replacement of positions made vacant by natural attrition • Non renewal of fixed contracts where appropriate

- Non-VPS staff include Legal and Science Adaptives, AWU Field Staff and PFFs and Drivers.
- Total FTE is based on FRD 029

Question 27

In the tables below, please detail the salary costs for 2011-12, broken down by ongoing, fixed-term and casual and explain any variations greater than 10 per cent between the years for each category.

Employment category	Gross salary 2010-11	Gross salary 2011-12	Explanation for any variations greater than ± 10 per cent
	(\$ million)	(\$ million)	
Ongoing	236.261	251.615	The variance is less than

			10%.
Fixed-term	31.781	18.807	The variance reflects the proportional decrease in fixed term staff due to contracts not being renewed prior to June 2012 as part of SGI initiatives
Casual	2.131	2.003	The variance is less than 10%.
Total	270.173	272.425	The variance is less than 10%.

Question 28

Please detail the impact on your department's/agency's expenditure of any EBAs agreed in 2011-12 and how any additional costs were funded.

EBA	Impact in 2011-12 (\$ million)	How the impact was funded
No EBA's were agreed in 2011-12 financial year.		

Question 29

Please provide the following details about staff number changes in 2011-12 (please provide all data as FTE):

	Target for 2011-12		Actual for 2011-12	Reason for any variation between target and actual	Impact of reduction or increase in staff numbers on services delivery
	Pre SGI	Post SGI			
Total change in staff numbers (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)			-218.9 (net)	Meeting the target early is part of the DSE strategy to ensure employees can go back to “business as usual” and give teams and individuals the mental preparation needed for the next fire season.	The Department continues review service delivery areas to identify where efficiency improvements can be made.
Change in the number of head office staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)	Consistent with whole of government direction, the Department did not have a ‘pre SGI’ target for staff numbers, and there was no ‘post SGI’ target in 2011-12.		The Department does not report on changes according to the categories “head office” or “front line staff”. As per SGI guidelines, the Department has focused any changes on non front line staff.		
Change in the number of front-line staff* (please indicate + for increase and – for decrease)					
Number of staff reduced through resignation and retirement			170.5	Targets set as part of SGI initiatives were across the department and not broken down into the cohorts listed here.	Recruitment processes are in place with Secretarial approval required for replacement of roles deemed critical.
Number of staff reduced through non-renewal of contracts	74.2	Targets set as part of SGI initiatives were across the department and not broken down into the cohorts listed here.	All fixed term staff requirements are reviewed monthly and individual contracts are not renewed unless they are identified as providing an essential service.		
Number of staff reduced through VDPs	Nil	VDP program not active in 2011-12	VDP program not active in 2011-12		

Number of staff reduced through TSPs (Please note TSPs are not linked to SGI)		27.4	Individual TSPs were undertaken by DSE on a case by case basis and were not linked to SGI.	Recruitment policies and reviews are in place and are designed to maintain front line service delivery.
Number of staff reduced through other means		52.3	Targets set as part of SGI initiatives were across the department and not broken down into the cohorts listed here.	Recruitment policies and reviews are in place and are designed to maintain front line service delivery.
Costs associated with staff reductions (e.g. VDP and redundancies pay-outs)		\$527,498.30	VDP costs not included as the program did not commence until the 2012-13 year.	

* Please indicate how you have defined 'head office staff' and 'front-line staff'.

The Department does not distinguish between head office and front line staff in its annual reporting.

Question 30

- (a) For what roles within your organisation were contractors or contract staff used in 2011-12 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of contractors)?

The Department employs contractors and contract staff on an one-off basis to provide services where the Department does not have the necessary expertise or capacity to service internally. DSE engages contractors to undertake on-ground works including: bridge construction, fencing, geotechnical work and fire roles (for example - hire of external plant/aircraft and operators to provide additional fire response capacity).

Additionally, the Department employs contractors on a one-off basis to fill short term roles to backfill for fixed term or ongoing roles during recruitment to hire a fixed term or ongoing replacement. Contractors are not used as part of the Department's ongoing workforce.

- (b) Please itemise the services delivered by contractors or contract staff in 2011-12:

Service category	Number of contractors/contract staff	Value of services (\$)
Sustainable water management and supply	This information is not available at the service category level.	39,064,525
Natural Resources	This information is not available at the service category level.	3,166,886
Public Land	This information is not available at the service category level.	19,726,499
Forests and Parks	This information is not available at the service category level.	9,778,923
Land and Fire Management	This information is not available at the service category level.	30,676,174
Biodiversity	This information is not available at the service category level.	17,734,423
Land Administration and Property Information	This information is not available at the service category level.	22,603,331
Corporate Services	This information is not available at the service category level.	25,281,175
Environment Policy and Climate Change	This information is not available at the service category level.	4,186,863

- (c) For each specific contractor or contract staff paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2011-12, please supply the following details:

Supplier	Purpose	Value of services (\$)	Number of contractors/contract staff (FTE) employed for longer than 12 months	Reasons why a VPS employee or equivalent could not undertake the work
<p>In accordance with the requirements of Victorian Government Policy and associated guidelines, summary details of all contracts with a commitment value greater than \$100,000 are disclosed on the Victorian Government Purchasing Board (VGPB) website.</p> <p>The link for DSE is https://www.tenders.vic.gov.au/tenders/contract/list.do?showSearch=false&action=contract-search-submit&issuingBusinessId=43&issuingBusinessIdForSort=43&awardDateFromString=05/10/2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSE uses contractors and contract staff for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short term roles to backfill for fixed term or ongoing roles during recruitment to hire a fixed term or ongoing replacement Providers of generalist services within DSE facilities such as tradespeople and cleaners Specialist professional services or roles such as general consultancy, engineers, geotechnical specialists, legal, audit and organisational development providers On-ground works such as fencing, stream bank stabilisation and revegetation. 				

Question 31

- (a) For what roles within your organisation were consultants used in 2011-12 (refer to Explanatory Memorandum for definition of consultants)?

The Department of Sustainability and Environment did not use any consultants as defined by Financial Reporting Direction 22C *Standard Disclosures in the Report of Operations*.

- (b) Please itemise the services delivered by consultants in 2011-12:

Service category	Number of consultants	Value of services (\$)
Nil		

- (c) For each specific consultant paid in excess of \$100,000 per annum that has been engaged by your organisation during 2011-12, please supply the following details:

Supplier	Purpose	Value of services (\$)	Number of consultants (FTE) employed for longer than 12 months	Reasons why a VPS employee or equivalent could not undertake the work
Nil				

Question 32

Please complete the following tables showing number of executive staff and total value of bonuses paid in the 2011-12 performance periods:

Executive category	Number of staff (FTE)			Total value of bonuses paid (\$)
	Eligible for a performance bonus	Not awarded bonus payment	Awarded bonus payment	
E01 and E02 ^(a)	16.0	4.0	12.0	185,527
EO3	27.8	9.0	18.8	192,381
Other Executives	-	-	-	-
Other staff	-	-	-	-

Note (a): Combine categories to preserve confidentiality where necessary

Question 33

In the following table, please show for your organisation the actual range of bonuses paid in 2011-12 (expressed as a percentage of total remuneration).

Rating	Proportion of total remuneration package actually paid (expressed as a range from x% to y%)
Exceptional	-
Superior	2% - 9%
Competent	-
Improvement required	-

The above format is based on the Executive Employment Handbook. If your organisation adopted another approach for awarding bonuses, please provide details.

N/A

Question 34

Please detail the number of executives who received increases in their remuneration in 2011-12, breaking that information down according to what proportion of their salary the increase was, and explaining the reasons for executives' salaries increasing in each bracket.

Increase in base remuneration	Number of executives receiving increases in their base rate of remuneration of this amount	Reasons for these increases
0-3 per cent	2	Promotion and a whole-of-role comparison/benchmarking
3-5 per cent	-	

5-10 per cent	-	
10-15 per cent	-	
greater than 15 per cent	-	

Question 35 (Department of Treasury and Finance only)

This question does not apply to your department.

SECTION F: Program outcomes

Outcomes reflect the impact on the community of the goods and services provided by a department. The questions in this section all relate to the outcomes that your department/agency contributed to in 2011-12.

Question 36

- (a) Using the format of the table below, please outline the five most important outcomes in the community⁸ achieved by your organisation's programs/activities in 2011-12 (where your organisation has been the key player) including:
- (i) what was planned;
 - (ii) what was achieved;
 - (iii) quantitative or qualitative data to demonstrate this achievement;
 - (iv) any other Victorian public sector organisations or agencies from other jurisdictions that have worked across organisational boundaries to contribute to this outcome; and
 - (v) the relationship of these outcomes to any government strategies or goals.

Planned outcome to be achieved	Description of actual outcome achieved	Quantitative or qualitative data to demonstrate outcome	Other agencies involved	Relationship to major government strategy
1. Delivering effective management of water resources	A series of significant flood events occurred across Victoria in 2011-12, impacting communities and agricultural activity in 33 local government areas. As part of the response effort, the Department deployed aircraft and provided incident management staff and flood	For quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates the outcomes achieved, please refer to the Sustainable Water Management and Supply Output on page 308 of the Victorian Government 2011-12 Service Delivery Budget Paper No. 3 For specific case studies and further examples of outcomes	Metropolitan Water Authorities Rural and Regional Water Authorities Catchment Management Authorities	Living Melbourne Living Victoria Road Map

⁸ 'outcomes' are the impact of service delivery on the community rather than a description of the services delivered

	<p>mapping and prediction specialists to work in planning, operations and logistic in the Incident Control Centre and the State Control Centre.</p> <p>The Office of Living Victoria (OLV) was established on 22 May 2012 to drive reform by coordinating urban and water planning. OLV is part of the Victorian Government's new approach to managing Victoria's urban water systems to achieve a more liveable, sustainable and productive State – as specified in Living Melbourne, Living Victoria.</p> <p>The Department also played a key role in finalising the \$1.2 billion funding agreement with the Commonwealth Government for Stage 2 of the Northern Victorian Irrigation Renewal Project.</p>	<p>achieved, please refer to the <i>Effective management of water resources to meet future urban, rural and environmental needs</i> Output Performance section on page 39 of the Department's 2012 Annual Report.</p>		
2. Reducing the threat of fire	<p>Despite one of the wettest years on record, during 2011-12, the Department, in conjunction with its partner agencies, undertook the largest planned burning program in two decades. Over 197,000 hectares were burnt to protect key assets.</p> <p>The Department and Parks Victoria completed 834 planned burns as part of an integrated plan to reduce bushfire risk to people, property and communities.</p> <p>The Department also implemented recommendations 37 and 43 from the 2009</p>	<p>For quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates the outcomes achieved, please refer to the Effective Management of Fire Output on page 318 of the Victorian Government 2011-12 Service Delivery Budget Paper No. 3</p> <p>For specific case studies and further examples of outcomes achieved, please refer to the <i>Reduced impact of major bushfires and other extreme events on people, infrastructure and the environment</i> Output Performance section on page 60 of the Department's 2012 Annual</p>	DSE's Networked Emergency Organisation Partners (CFA, MFB, Parks Victoria)	Reducing the Threat of Fire is linked to the document "Implementing the Government's Response to the 2009 Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission" released in May 2011.

	<p>Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission (VBRC) by developing a statewide hazard map and detailed vegetation and biodiversity mapping products for the State.</p> <p>In addition, the Department undertook a review of the Code of Practice for Fire Management on Public Land following recommendations by VBRC. The revised code establishes overarching objectives for bushfire management on public land and was tabled in April 2012.</p>	Report.		
3. Public Land Bridges Project	<p>The Public Land Bridges Project is a four-year initiative which commenced in 2008 to provide better access to water catchments, parks and reserves, forests and other public land – especially for firefighting and planned burning.</p> <p>The project achieved its goal to replace or upgrade 300 bridges and crossings on public land across Victoria.</p>	<p>For quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates the outcomes achieved, please refer to the Effective management of fire Output on page 318 and 319 of the Victorian Government 2011-12 Service Delivery Budget Paper No. 3</p> <p>For specific case studies and further examples of outcomes achieved, please refer to the <i>Reduced impact of major bushfires and other extreme events on people, infrastructure and the environment</i> Output Performance section on page 63 of the Department's 2012 Annual Report.</p>	N/A	The Public Land Bridges Project is linked to the document "Implementing the Government's Response to the 2009 Victorian Bushfires Royal Commission" released in May 2011.
4. Promoting new standards for protecting the environment	The Department has continued to focus on providing support for the Victorian community to contribute to practical on-ground solutions for local environmental	For quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates the outcomes achieved, please refer to the Healthy and Resilient Natural Environment Output on page 315 of the Victorian	Catchment Management Authorities Department of Primary Industries	Environmental Partnerships

	<p>issues.</p> <p>The \$20 million <i>Communities for Nature Program</i> provides community groups, schools, committees of management and traditional owners with funding to conduct projects that will protect and enhance their local environment.</p> <p>The first grant round was announced in April 2012. A total of 312 grant applications were assessed with 123 projects selected to share more than \$4.5 million in grants.</p> <p>In 2011-12, the Department commenced a review of the current waste policy in response to the Victorian Auditor-General's Office performance audit on <i>Municipal Solid Waste Management</i>.</p> <p>The review will examine the strategic, legislative, institutional and investment settings that influence the nature and performance of waste management in Victoria.</p>	<p>Government 2011-12 Service Delivery Budget Paper No. 3</p> <p>For specific case studies and further examples of outcomes achieved, please refer to the <i>Effective environmental and climate change policy, investment and regulation</i> Output Performance section on page 44 of the Department's 2012 Annual Report.</p>		
5. Adapting to the impacts of climate change	<p>The Department is committed to supporting Victorian communities to adapt to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The Victorian Adaptation and Sustainability Partnership (formerly the Victorian Local Sustainability Accord) is a relationship program between State and local government in Victoria.</p>	<p>For quantitative and qualitative data which demonstrates the outcomes achieved, please refer to the Healthy and Resilient Natural Environment Output on page 315 of the Victorian Government 2011-12 Service Delivery Budget Paper No. 3</p> <p>For specific case studies and further examples of outcomes achieved, please refer to the</p>	<p>The Department of Planning and Community Development Local Government</p>	<p>Climate Change Act 2010</p> <p><i>The Victorian Government Response to the Review of the Climate Change Act</i></p>

	<p>During 2011-12 the Partnership allocated \$5.67 million in grants to 57 council-led sustainability and climate change projects across Victoria.</p> <p>The introduction of the Commonwealth Clean Energy Bills in to the Commonwealth Parliament triggered section 19 of the Victorian Climate Change Act 2010 (the Act) which required the Minister for Environment and Climate Change to undertake a review of the Act.</p> <p>An independent review of the Act occurred and the Victorian Government tabled the independent review of the Act and the Victorian Government response to the Climate Change Act Review in the Victorian Parliament on 27 March 2012.</p> <p>The Victorian Government response to the Review of the Act accepts the majority of the Review findings and confirms the Victorian Government has a reduced role in emissions mitigation in light of a national carbon price, and instead has a focus on managing and adapting to climate risks and supporting communities under a carbon price.</p>	<p><i>Effective environmental and climate change policy, investment and regulation</i> Output Performance section on page 44 of the Department's 2012 Annual Report.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

(c) Please also identify any significant program outcomes that were planned but not achieved in 2011-12 and the underlying reasons.

N/A

Question 37

This question does not apply to your department.

SECTION G: Previous recommendations**Question 38 (departments only)**

For each recommendation in the Committee's *Report on the 2009-10 and 2010-11 Financial and Performance Outcomes* that relates to an area relevant to your department or one of its portfolio agencies, please indicate:

- (a) whether or not the action specified in the recommendation has been implemented;
- (b) if so, how it has been implemented and what publicly available information (if any) demonstrates the implementation of the recommendation; and
- (c) if not, why not.

The Government tabled a Whole of Government Response in both Houses of Parliament on 19 October 2012. The Committee is referred to that document. Implementation of those recommendations made by the Committee and supported by the Government is proceeding and the Department will be in a position to respond once that process has concluded.